DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 389 165 FL 023 329

AUTHOR	Uzawa, Kozue
TITLE	Translation, L1 Writing, and L2 Writing of Japanese ESL Learners.
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics (Long Beach, CA, 1995).
AVAILABLE FROM	Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics, Secretariat, University of Quebec at Montreal, Linguistics Department, CP 8888, Succ. A, Montreal, Quebec, H3C 3P8, Canada.
PUB TYPE	Journal Articles (080) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
JOURNAL CIT	Journal of the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics; v16 n2 p119-134 Aut 1994
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Cognitive Processes; College Students; English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Interference (Language); *Japanese; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; Second Language Learning; *Translation; *Writing Evaluation; Written Language
IDENTIFIERS	Canada

ABSTRACT

In this Canadian college study, 22 Japanese, English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) learners' translation processes and writings were examined and contrasted with the same group's first-language (L1) and second-language (L2) writing performance. All subjects (aged 19-23 years) had been educated in Japan in Japanese prior to attending English-language college in Canada. Half had already been trained in translation, while the other half had no translation training. Data were analyzed with special attention to three cognitive theories of language learning: Cummins' 1986 theories of cross-linguistics interdependence of cognitive academic skills; Schmidt's 1990 theories on conscious attention; and McLaughlin's 1990 theories on restructuring. Cross-linguistic interdependence among translation, L1 writing, and L2 writing was not found. However, evidence was found that translation processes prompted conscious attention and restructuring, as considered necessary for L2 learning. An appendix includes actual student writing samples. (Contains numerous references.) (Author/NAV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert A Papen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 389 165

Translation, L_1 Writing, and L_2 Writing of Japanese ESL Learners

Kozue Uzawa
University of British Columbia

While translation in L_2 learning/teaching has been viewed negatively since the 1950s in North America, a re-evaluation of translation has begun (Duff, 1989). In the present study, 22 Japanese ESL learners' translation processes and writings were examined and contrasted with the same group's L_1 and L_2 writing performance. The data were analysed with attention given to three recent cognitive theories of language learning: Cummins' theories (1986) of cross-linguistic interdependence of cognitive academic skills; Schmidt's "conscious attention" (1990); and McLaughlin's "restructuring" (1990). Cross-linguistic interdependence among translation, L_1 writing, and L_2 writing was not evident. However, there was evidence that translation processes prompted conscious attention and restructuring, which are considered to be necessary for L_2 learning.

Alors que la traduction dans le domaine de l'enseignement/apprentissage d'une langue seconde a été perçue de façon négative depuis les années cinquante en Amérique du Nord, une réévaluation de la traduction a vu le jour (Duff, 1989). Dans l'étude présentée ici, on a examiné les processus de traduction et les textes de 22 étudiants japonais d'anglais langue seconde et on les a comparés aux performances à l'écrit en L_1 et en L_2 du même groupe. Les données ont été analysées en tenant compte de trois théories cognitives récentes dans l'apprentissage des langues: la théorie de Cummins (1986) sur l'interdépendance interlinguistique dans l'apprentissage scolaire des connaissances; celle de l'«attention consciente» de Schmidt (1990); et celle de «restructuration» de McLaughlin (1990). L'interdépendance interlinguistique dans la traduction, l'écriture en L_1 et l'écriture en L_2 ne s'est pas avérée évidente. Cependant, on a décelé des preuves que les processus de traduction entraînent une attention consciente et une restructuration, deux éléments jugés essentiels à l'apprentissage d'une L_2.

TRANSLATION IS SEEMINGLY A NECESSITY in a world of shared information and global relationships. However, although translation itself has a long history, research in translation in a language-learning context, compared to research in second-language (L_2) writing, has been scarce (Krings, 1987).

Research in second-language writing became active following the student-centred process approach in first-language (L_1) writing in English. From the early 1970s to the 1980s, English educators and researchers shifted their attention from analyses of written texts toward studies that also addressed learners' writing processes (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987; Emig, 1971; Langer and Applebee, 1987), and commented that writing essays and compositions (rather than writing word-level or sentence-level exercises) is necessary for students to think and learn (Applebee, 1982; Emig, 1977; Langer and Applebee,

FL023329

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1984, 1987). Writing is a personal, self-paced problem-solving activity. A role for "writing as heuristic" (Emig, 1977) has been alluded to by many thinkers and educators. Second language–writing researchers found many parallels between first- and second-language writing, commenting that second-language writing is also a personal, self-paced problem-solving activity (Cumming, 1988; Raimes, 1985, 1987; Zamel, 1976, 1982, 1983).

Many second language–writing researchers (Cumming, 1988; Jones and Tetroe, 1987; Raimes, 1985, 1987; Zamel, 1983) also say that characteristics of first-language writing processes are also found in second-language writing processes of skilled and unskilled writers. Referring to Cummins' theories, they say that writing skills developed in a learner's mother tongue will appear in second-language writing.

Cummins' (1979, 1984, 1986) well-quoted theories of cross-linguistic interdependence of cognitive academic skills have been empirically tested by researchers in second-language writing (Cumming, 1988, 1989; Cumming, Rebuffot and Ledwell, 1989; Jones and Tetroe, 1987; Raimes, 1987). Cummins said that cognitive academic skills, such as reading strategies, writing composition skills, and higher-order thinking skills developed in a person's first language would largely transfer to a second language provided there is adequate exposure to L_2 and adequate motivation to learn L_2. Researchers in second-language writing agree with Cummins. They found that writing skills in L_1 largely transfer to L_2 writing and that second-language general proficiency (mainly speaking) is not directly related to L_2 writing skills.

Cummins' theories, however, have not been tested using second-language learners' translation performances. This may be because translation in second-language learning has been negatively viewed by many researchers and educators. It has often been deemed a sentence-level activity, one that may not require deep thinking. Applebee (1982) unfavourably asserts that direct translation from one language to another is "writing without composing" because "the text to be translated provides the global structure, within which the translator can operate at a sentence-by-sentence level" (p. 371).

In the late 1950s and up until the early 1980s, translation was particularly rejected in second-language pedagogy along with the grammar-translation method in North America. Translation was seen as a definite cause of "interference" in second-language learning (Sorhus, 1975). Even today, translation is ignored as a valid activity for language practice and improvement largely due to the communicative movement of the 1980s, which put a strong emphasis on spoken communicative competence (Krashen, 1981; Chaudron, 1988; Ellis, 1988). Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) comment that the second language is a new and independent language system and that contrasting the L_1 and L_2, or translation, does not help the learner to "acquire" the second language. Krashen (1981) says:

> studies that report a high amount of first language influence ... are mostly foreign and not second language studies, situations in which natural appropriate intake is scarce and where translation *exercises* are frequent (p. 66, emphasis mine).

In spite of the banishment of translation in second-language pedagogy, some researchers see values in translation within language learning. Duff (1989) comments that translation activities in the classroom help students to better understand the influence of one language on the other because translation involves contrast. He comments that through translation, the learner develops three qualities essential to all language learning: accuracy, clarity, and flexibility. Translation, he says, "trains the learner to search (flexibility) for the most appropriate words (accuracy) to convey what is meant (clarity)" (p. 7). Snell-Hornby (1985) also says that translation allows the student to learn to judge what is equivalent and what is not between L_1 and L_2; hence it is a worthwhile exercise in gaining mastery of, and knowledge about, a foreign language.

Harris (1977, 1978) views translation as a natural skill, saying that all bilinguals and students who learn a second language do translate even if the method used ignores or forbids it. Cumming (1990) and Uzawa and Cumming (1989) report that adult language learners, when they write in a second language, often compare and contrast L_1 and L_2, and translate/back-translate, consciously, in order to express what they really want to say. Translation, thus, seems to be a natural way of processing a second language for many adult L_2 learners.

Theories of "Conscious Attention" and "Restructuring"

Translation and second-language writing may be very conscious ways of learning a second language. And this concept of "consciousness" has been a key issue in second language–learning research since the 1980s. Schmidt (1990) reviews theories on conscious and unconscious learning, and claims that "subliminal language learning is impossible, and that intake is what learners consciously notice. This requirement of noticing is meant to apply equally to all aspects of language (lexicon, phonology, grammatical form, pragmatics)" (p. 149).

Schmidt's view contrasts with Krashen's (1981) theories, which distinguish between ~~between~~ second-language "learning" and second-language "acquisition." According to Krashen, conscious "learning" does not promote language "acquisition," which is unconscious. However, many researchers (Ellis, 1986; McLaughlin, 1987; Wenden and Rubin, 1987; for example) disagree with Krashen, saying that the distinction between conscious learning and unconscious acquisition is not necessary and that "conscious" learning (such as learning grammar rules, contrasting L_1 and L_2, paying attention, controlled processing, learning strategies, reflection) facilitates the adult learner's acquisition/learning of a second language. Schmidt (1990) says "those who notice most learn most, and it may be that those who notice most are those who pay attention most, as a general disposition or on particular occasions" (p. 144). Ellis (1993) similarly comments that "consciousness-raising" is effective for language teaching. Hence, if translation and second-language writing are effective for learning a second language, this may be due to the learner's conscious attention to L_1/L_2 linguistic aspects.

Along with conscious learning, the concept of "restructuring" is important in recent cognitive theories of second-language learning. Cognitive theories claim that "reorganization" of grammar rules acquired wrongly and/or partially, or "restructuring" syntactic and semantic correspondences between L_1 and L_2, are necessary processes in language development (Ellis, 1986; Ijaz, 1986; Karmiloff-Smith, 1986; Lightbown, 1985; McLaughlin, 1987, 1990).

Cheng (1985) comments, from an information-processing perspective, that improvement in performance in cognitive tasks, such as solving arithmetic problems (for example, "Find the sum of ten 2s"), can be "due to a restructuring of the task components" (p. 414), rather than simple automaticity. That is, the learner performs better in the task by restructuring perceptual and cognitive units (from adding ten 2s to multiplying 2 by 10). McLaughlin (1990) also comments: "Restructuring is characterized by discontinuous, or *qualitative*, change as the child moves from stage to stage in development. Each new stage constitutes a new internal organization and not merely the addition of new structural elements" (p. 117).

Similarly, in second-language acquisition, when the learner encounters new forms, s/he often restructures the system, rather than merely adding new forms to the existing system (Lightbown, 1985). Ijaz (1986) comments that "in many instances, a lexical item in the L_2 cannot be directly mapped onto a concept existing in the L_1," therefore, "the L_2 learner has to restructure existing L_1 concepts or develop a new concept that corresponds to a lexical item in the L_2" (p. 405). In translation, examples from Biggs and Collis (1982) may illustrate the restructuring of L_1/L_2 correspondences. For example, the French expression *"sa table de nuit"* may be translated as "his table of night" or "his bedside table." In the second translation, "his bedside table," there seems to be a restructuring of semantic and syntactic L_1/L_2 correspondences. The first one, however, shows no trace of restructuring. It is a direct one-to-one correspondence between words in two languages. There is a qualitative difference between the two translations.

Translation and second-language writing may have value for learning a second language when the learner pays conscious attention to language use (grammar, vocabulary, syntax, text, register, sociolinguistic aspects, spelling and so on) and when this conscious attention leads to restructuring semantic and syntactic correspondences between L_1 and L_2.

Research Questions

Translation and second-language writing from a perspective of second-language learning have seldom been studied empirically, although researchers and educators in the late 1980s touched on the prospects of translation and second-language writing for language learning (Butzkamm, 1985; Cumming, 1990; Duff, 1989; Raimes, 1983; Titford and Hieke, 1985). Theories of conscious learning and restructuring may lead toward why translation and second-language writing may foster language learning, but no empirical studies on this subject are evident. Thus many questions remain: How are translation skills

related to first- and second-language writing skills? How often do learners pay conscious attention while translating and writing in L_1 and L_2? How do their conscious attentions relate to their translating and writing skills? How do language learners restructure L_1/L_2 semantic and syntactic correspondences while translating? What do learners think about translation and second-language writing as a means of second-language learning?

Considering these questions, the following five research questions were formulated.

1. How does the quality of second-language learners' translation correlate with the quality of their L_1 and L_2 writing?

2. What do second-language learners pay conscious attention to while translating and writing?

3. How often do second-language learners pay attention to language use while translating and writing?

4. How do second-language learners restructure L_1/L_2 semantic and syntactic correspondences while translating?

5. What do second-language learners think about translation and second-language writing tasks?

Participants

Twenty-two Japanese students volunteered to participate in the study. All of them were learning English as a second language at a Canadian college, where academic subjects, such as environmental studies, international business, academic writing, and translation/interpretation, are offered in English for Japanese students.

All of the participants had studied in Japan for 12 years (up to the high-school level) before coming to Canada. None of them had taken the TOEFL at the time of this study. The participants ranged in age from 19 to 23, and had been in Canada for 1.5 to 3.5 years. None of the participants had professional experience in writing or translation.

Participants were classified according to number of years in Canada and "training" in translation at the college (Table 1). Participants in the "trained" group had been taking the translation/interpretation course at the college for some time at the point of being interviewed; students in the fourth-year group had been studying translation and interpretation for 1.5 to 2.5 years; those in the second-year group, for half a year. According to the instructors at the college, however, actual training in translation was one hour a week for 33 weeks in one academic year. None of the "trained" participants had ever undertaken translation professionally. The participants in the "not trained" group had never taken

the course at the college and none had any professional experience doing translation.

Table 1

Classification of Participants

	Trained in translation	Not trained in translation
Fourth-year	6 (m = 3, f = 3)	7 (m = 2, f = 5)
Second-year	5 (m = 0, f = 5)	4 (m = 1, f = 3)

Tasks

- Translation Task (Japanese into English)
  An article from the April 1990 issue of the *Nihongo Journal*, which is for learners of Japanese as a second/foreign language, was used for this task. This article was selected because the text is easy to read for most native speakers of Japanese, while translation of the text into English is challenging since some words and expressions contained within are hard to translate in English. The publisher's English translation (reprinted here in the Appendix) was attached to the article, so this was used as a guide/model translation for evaluating the students' translations.

- L_1 Writing Task (Japanese)
  The topic was taken from Jones and Tetroe (1987): *Describe the most difficult adjustment that you have had to make living in Canada.* This topic was selected for the present study because it seemed contextually appropriate for Japanese ESL students in Canada.

- L_2 Writing Task (English)
  The topic was also taken from Jones and Tetroe (1987) and modified a little according to our needs (for the present study, one word in Jones and Tetroe, "Venezuelan," was changed to "Japanese"): *What is the most important difference between Canadian and Japanese society?* This topic seemed appropriate for the present study because our participants had been studying in Canada for 1.5 to 3.5 years, and seemed to be familiar with Canadian society.

The difference between the topics of the L_1 and L_2 writing tasks should hardly affect the participants' writing performance. Cumming (1988) comments that the level of cognitive demand (e.g., argument vs. personal letter writing), rather than simple differences in topics, affects the learner's L_2 writing perform-

ance. Since both topics in the present study require "descriptive" writing, the level of cognitive demand in the two writing tasks seems equal (of course, L_2 writing is more demanding than L_1 writing, but I refer here to the topics only). Likewise, the content of the translation task is also "descriptive." Thus, the level of cognitive demand in the three tasks (again, as far as the topics and content are concerned) is similar.

Procedures

The researcher met each participant in a small classroom on campus. Before beginning the three tasks, each participant was asked four questions regarding translation and second-language writing as a means of learning a second language (e.g., "Generally speaking, do you think that translation tasks are helpful or not so helpful for learning or improving a second language?"). The participants were asked to rate their responses (5 = Very helpful, 3 = Neutral, 1 = Not helpful at all). Also, open-ended questions were asked by developing and extending the prepared questions (e.g., "Why do you think that second-language writing tasks are very helpful/not so helpful for learning/improving a second language?"). The distinction between "learning" and "improving" in these questions was explained to the participants so that "learning" meant beginner- to intermediate-level acquisition, and "improving" meant advanced-level acquisition in language learning.

Then, each participant was told to write a first draft, thinking aloud, that is, verbalizing their thoughts while translating/writing (thinking aloud was demonstrated by the researcher, and each participant practised it before beginning the tasks). They were encouraged to use dictionaries while writing and translating. One hour each was allocated for the translation and L_2 writing tasks, and half an hour was the time limit for L_1 writing. The suggested length for each of the L_1 and L_2 writing tasks was one page, double-spaced. Most students finished their three tasks in less than the allocated time. Nobody experienced "writer's block" during the writing session.

The researcher sat just beside the participant, taking observational notes, while s/he performed the three tasks. Think-aloud utterances were recorded using a small tape-recorder. The researcher basically remained silent, just nodding from time to time, responding to the participant's comments and questions. For some participants who tended to forget to verbalize, the researcher occasionally reminded them to verbalize or asked the participants questions (e.g., "What are you thinking now?").

The following semi-structured, open-ended questions regarding "conscious attention" were asked in Japanese just after the completion of each task in order to complement the think-aloud protocols. The questions overlapped one another intentionally in order to maximize each student's answers.

1. Where did you pay attention most in this task?

2. What do you think is the most important aspect of this task?

3. What was the most difficult aspect of this task?

4. If you were asked to revise this text for publication later, how and what would you like to revise?

Evaluation of Writing Samples

The quality of the participants' written texts was evaluated by two independent judges (one for each language) who were native speakers and experienced language teachers, using holistic scoring and the ESL Composition Profile developed by Jacobs et al. (1981). For the present study, however, the ESL Composition Profile was modified a little. That is, the two judges evaluated writing samples using a four-point scale (max = 4, min = 1) in three categories (content, organization, language use). In the case of the translation, only one category (language use) was evaluated because content and organization were given by the text assigned. The English evaluators assessed participants' translations by referring to a model translation in the *Nihongo Journal* (see Appendix). Inter-rater reliability was .678 (translation), .952 (L_1 writing), .835 (L_2 writing). The sum of scores (max = 8, min = 2) produced by the two judges for each task was used for statistical calculation.

Results

Research Question 1: *How does the quality of second-language learners' translation correlate with the quality of their L_1 and L_2 writing?*

The rank order correlation of the quality of the 22 students' writing samples in the three tasks (Translation vs. L_1; Translation vs. L_2; L_1 vs. L_2) was calculated using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) and the Spearman correlation coefficient (rho). Raw scores produced by the judges were then converted into percentages, and the four groups (4T, 4N, 2T, 2N) were compared in each task using ANOVA (analysis of variance).

Previous studies in second-language writing, such as Cumming's (1988), support Cummins' theories of cross-linguistic interdependence of cognitive academic skills, saying that writing skills developed in learners' mother tongues would transfer to their second- language writing. However, in this study, correlations among translation, L_1 writing, and L_2 writing were not clearly confirmed (Language Use in L_1 vs. L_2: r = .472; Trans. vs. L_1: r = .004; Trans. vs. L_2: r = .365). This may be because all the participants were student writers/translators, not professionals. However, there was a tendency, although it was not significant, for the fourth-year, trained-in-translation students (4T) to do better than the other three groups in the three tasks (Table 2).

Table 2

Group Comparisons of Quality of Writing Samples

	No. of Students	Translation Means	L_1 Writing Means	L_2 Writing Means
Year x Training				
4T	6	74.08%	69.65%	71.15%
2T	5	67.26%	60.28%	62.88%
4N	7	67.70%	70.63%	61.70%
2N	4	72.85%	51.66%	56.74%

A difference of one or two years in school learning, as observed in this study, may not translate into a significant difference in the quality of translation or L_2 writing if we follow Cummins' theories. Contrary to face-to-face communicative competence in L_2, cognitive academic skills such as L_2 writing and reading skills take several years to develop (Cummins, 1984).

In addition, the target language here (English) is linguistically very different from the learners' mother tongue (Japanese). Learning a language that is quite different from L_1 may take three to five times longer than learning one similar to L_1 (e.g., Indo-European languages similar to one another).

Research Question 2: *What do second-language learners pay conscious attention to while translating and writing?*

This question was approached by classifying the participants' answers to interview questions regarding "conscious attention" (see Procedures, above) into four aspects: content, organization, language use, and audience. Contrary to our expectations (Cumming, 1990; Uzawa and Cumming, 1989), half of the participants in this study did not pay conscious attention to "language use" (grammar, vocabulary, expression, sentence structure, spelling, etc.) in L_2 writing. However, all of the participants were conscious about "language use" in the translation task. Attention to "content" was very high in the three tasks (16–19 students out of 22). All of the students paid attention to "organization" in the L_2 writing task, while only 13 students did so in the translation task. The number of participants who paid attention to "audience" was very small in the three tasks (5–9 students out of 22).

Research Question 3: *How often do second-language learners pay attention to language use while translating and writing?*

Research Question 3 was approached by analysing the think-aloud data. The transcribed think-aloud protocols were classified into four attention levels—attention to content, attention to text organization, attention to language

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

use, and metacomments (comments about the writer's own writing habits, etc.) and converted into percentage. Then a factorial analysis of variance with four factors was used for statistical calculation: Attention (4 levels) x Tasks (3 levels) x Training (2 levels) x Year (2 levels).

It was found that the attention to language use depended upon the task (i.e., there was no difference among the four groups). The participants' attention to language use in the (L_1 and L_2) writing tasks was very similar (means: 31% and 27%, respectively), but quite different in the translation task (means: 72%). The participants' attention to language use (vocabulary, expression, syntax, grammar, spelling, etc.) in the translation task was very high, but it was unexpectedly low in the L_2 writing task ($p = 0.0000$). The results corresponded to those of Research Question 2.

The participants' attention to language use may be related to the quality of their language use; their language use scores in the translation task were on average 11% higher than in the L_2 writing ($p = 0.0006$). (One student's writing samples appear in the Appendix.) In the L_2 writing task, the most participants seemed to have used "avoidance strategies" (Schachter, 1974), which are commonly employed by L_2 learners to make the L_2 task easier by avoiding difficult syntax and vocabulary in L_2.

Generally speaking, in the translation task, the participants were freed from the cognitive activities of generating and organizing ideas, and were able to concentrate on linguistic activities. Thus, their use of language and grammar may have been qualitatively better in the translation than in the L_2 writing.

Research Question 4: *How do second-language learners restructure L_1/L_2 semantic and syntactic correspondences while translating?*

In order to answer this question, the participants' written texts (translations) were analysed descriptively, and compared with the original text and model translation. The participants' think-aloud protocols were also analysed descriptively. Some examples from one student's think-aloud protocols are shown here (utterances are translated into English by the researcher):

- **"There is no sentence subject, so . . . 'a company,' 'a company,' is it odd?"**
  (The student supplied an English sentence subject, which is omitted in the Japanese sentence, after reading the text.)
- **"I'm gonna connect these sentences with a comma. . ."**
  (The student connected two short sentences in the Japanese text for the English translation.)
- **"And it lists various examples, so I insert 'for example'. . ."**
  (The student inserted "for example" in the English translation although it was not in the Japanese original text.)
- **"'Toyuu iken de aru' ('these are their opinions'), this phrase belongs to the above sentence. . . . Let's insert it here."**
  (The student moved the translated English phrase around so that the translated text would become logical.)

Contrary to Applebee's (1982) negative comments on translation tasks in the classroom, the analyses of the participants' translations and think-aloud protocols revealed that most students did not operate at a sentence-by-sentence level, and instances of restructuring beyond the sentence level were frequently discovered, as shown in the above examples. Certainly most participants restructured the Japanese sentences, phrases, expressions, and words in order to express them appropriately in the English context (Lightbown, 1985; Ijaz, 1986). In the L_2 writing task, however, because most students wrote directly in English using vocabulary and sentence structures that they knew well, and there was no "model" or "original" text, examples of restructuring were not discernable.

Research Question 5: *What do second-language learners think about translation and second-language writing tasks?*

The participants were asked four questions about their thoughts on translation and L_2 writing tasks as a means of learning and improving a second language, and their answers were recorded on a five-point scale (see Procedures, above). The results of Research Question 5 showed that the participants in this study generally regarded both translation and L_2 writing tasks as relatively helpful for learning and improving a second language (translation: 3.30–4.67; L_2 writing: 3.70–4.33). The profile analyses based on these answers showed no significant difference in thinking among the four groups.

In the interview, however, fourth-year students trained in translation said that L_2 writing tasks were not so helpful (compared to translation tasks) for improving a second language. They explained that they could write L_2 without much effort, just using easy vocabulary and syntax. They think that translation tasks are better because they can practice L_2 at a slightly higher level than their present one. Their answers were consistent with Swain's (1985) "i+1 output" hypothesis. In addition, many students expressed that speaking practice is also necessary for learning and improving a second language.

Discussion

Based on research findings stated in the previous section, two generalizations may be drawn.

First, the present research findings indicate that second-language learners who have obtained basic spoken communicative competence in L_2, but whose L_1 writing skills are still developing, tend to write L_2 compositions using only words and expressions that are readily accessible to them. Both translation and L_2 writing tasks are perceived by the learners to be helpful for learning and improving a second language, but translation tasks may be more helpful for improving learners' language use, because they are forced to produce conscious "i+1 output" in translation tasks. The quality of the students' language use in the translation task was significantly better than in the L_2 writing task in this study. However, L_2 writing tasks in the L_2 classroom are also necessary, because

translation tasks may not encourage independent content generation and text organization.

Second, translation tasks may provide good opportunities for "restructuring" L_1/L_2 correspondences for second-language learners. Second-language learners often restructure L_1 and L_2 corresponding phrases and sentences while translating. The research findings indicate that second-language learners seldom translate word for word; they often consider synonyms, and restructure L_1 phrases, sentences, and paragraphs according to the L_2, although the translated text may not necessarily be successful because of the students' particular lack of linguistic resources.

Thus, conclusions from this study might be reasonably stated as follows: Text-level translation (from L_1 into L_2) in L_2 learning deserves a closer look, as it provides potential opportunities for learners to improve their L_2 learning, 1) by paying conscious attention to language use and producing "i+1 output," and 2) by restructuring L_1 and L_2 correspondences at the word, phrase, sentence, and paragraph levels.

Appendix

Model Translation

Training New Employees

April is the month for joining companies. It's a time when many new employees come into being. To help these employees turn into good workers, companies start off by training them.

A variety of training methods are used. These methods differ according to the company. Some companies request a lecture from a famous person. Others teach the proper use of polite language. Sometimes, employees will go to a camp; this helps them adjust to working in a group. Some employees do Zen mediation at a temple. Zen meditation helps them build a calm, relaxed frame of mind.

Recently, a certain publishing company put together a textbook on employee education. The textbook, which is targeted to a generation of young people raised on comic books, consists of comics from cover to cover. In the book, a senior employee tells a new worker—in easy-to-understand terms—the ins and outs of the adult world. Eat breakfast before coming to work, he says. Read the newspaper. Leave the house about ten minutes ahead of time; pick a train that isn't too crowded. The comic is truly considerate.

To some people, such consideration is unnecessary. Yet other people feel that it is. Having suddenly embarked on the real world after many years as students, the young people are torn with anxiety. Companies have to make many efforts to reduce this anxiety—or so these people believe. The training of new employees has become an enormous issue facing today's companies (*The Nihongo Journal*, April, 1990, p. 28).

Student A's Translation

It is April to enter a company. It is time that many new employees appear. The company begins to educate to these people to be good employees.

There are many way of education. It is different between a company and a company. We'll ask a famous man to have a lecture. We will teach new employees how to use language. They will stay same house for one or two night for getting custom to a group life, and they will have religious meditations for making quiet and cool mind.

Recently one publication company made textbook of education for new employees, but it teaches rules of a public person plainly for young men of a comic time. We'll teach new employees these: Have a breakfast before your attendance. Read a newspaper. Choose and get on a bus which become less crowed before ten minutes earlier. It is a kind comic very well.

Some people said we don't need to give these kind, other said we need it. Young men who will appear to society from long school life suddenly feel a big uneasiness. That is a opinion that a company need to have many charenges for lessen the uneasiness. Education of new employees is a big problem of modern society.

Student A's L_2 Writing

I had many experiences in Canada, and I felt many difference between Canadian and Japanese society.

When I had homestay last summer, I found difference between Canadian and Japanese family, because my host mother was very strong for her children. Her children obeyed their mother. Their mother saying means demanding absolute obedience. There are no these stiff in Japanese family. Japanese children don't obey their parents, and Japanese parents aren't angry to their own children now. It is form of modern parents now.

When I was a child, my mother got angry to me. Of course, I was scared, but I think it was important for me to get my mother's angry. Now, Japanese children need true parents who are not only soft for them.

Bibliography

APPLEBEE, A. 1982. "Writing and learning in school settings." In *What Writers Know: The Language, Process and Structure of Written Discourse*. M. Nystrand (ed.). New York: Academic Press, pp. 365–381.

BEREITER, C. and M. SCARDAMALIA. 1987. *The Psychology of Written Composition*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

BIGGS, J. and K. COLLIS. 1982. *Evaluating the Quality of Learning: The SOLO Taxonomy (Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome)*. New York: Academic Press.

BUTZKAMM, W. 1985. "The use of formal translation equivalents in the teaching of foreign language structures." In *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching and Testing*. C. Titford and A.E. Hieke (eds.). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, pp. 87–97.

CHAUDRON, C. 1988. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHENG, P.W. 1985. "Restructuring versus automaticity: Alternative account of skill acquisition." *Psychological Review*, Vol. 92, No. 3, pp. 414–423.

CUMMING, A. 1988. "Writing expertise and second language proficiency in ESL writing performance." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto.

CUMMING, A. 1989. "Writing expertise and second language proficiency." *Language Learning*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 81–141.

CUMMING, A. 1990. "Metalinguistic and ideational thinking in second language composing." *Written Communication*, Vol. 7 , No. 4, pp. 482–511.

CUMMING, A., J. REBUFFOT and M. LEDWELL. 1989. "Reading and summarizing challenging texts in first and second languages." *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, Vol. 2, pp. 201–219.

CUMMINS, J. 1979. "Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters." *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, Vol. 19, pp. 197–205.

CUMMINS, J. 1984. *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

CUMMINS, J. 1986. "Language proficiency and academic achievement." In *Bilingualism in Education*, J. Cummins and M. Swain (eds.). London: Longman, pp. 138–161.

DUFF, A. 1989. *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DULAY, H., M. BURT and S. KRASHEN. 1982. *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.

ELLIS, R. 1986. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ELLIS, R. 1988. *Classroom Second Language Development*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

ELLIS, R. 1993. "The structural syllabus and second language acquisition." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 27 , No. 1, pp. 91–113.

EMIG, J. 1971. *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders*. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

EMIG, J. 1977. "Writing as a mode of learning." *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 28 , No. 2, pp. 122–128.

HARRIS, B. 1977. "The importance of natural translation." *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, Vol. 12, pp. 96–114.

HARRIS, B. 1978. "The difference between natural and professional translation." *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, Vol. 34, pp. 417–427.

IJAZ, I.H. 1986. "Linguistic and cognitive determinants of lexical acquisition in a second language." *Language Learning*, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 401–451.

JACOBS, H.L. et al. 1981. *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

JONES, S. and J. TETROE. 1987. "Composing in a second language." In *Writing in Real Time*. A. Matsuhashi (ed.). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, pp. 34–57.

KARMILOFF-SMITH, A. 1986. "Stage/structure versus phase/process in modelling linguistic and cognitive development." In *Stage and structure: Re-Opening the Debate*. I. Levin (ed.). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, pp. 164–190.

KRASHEN, S. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

KRINGS, H.P. 1987. "The use of introspective data in translation." In *Introspection in Second Language Research*. C. Faerch and G. Kasper (eds.). Philadelphia: Multulingual Matters, pp. 159–176.

LANGER, J. and A. APPLEBEE. 1984. "Language, learning, and interaction: A framework for improving the teaching of writing." In *Contexts for Learning to Write*. A. Applebee (ed.). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, pp. 169–181.

LANGER, J. and A. APPLEBEE. 1987. *How Writing Shapes Thinking: A Study of Teaching and Learning*. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE.

LIGHTBOWN, P. 1985. "Great expectations: Second-language acquisition research and classroom teaching." *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 173–189.

MCLAUGHLIN, B. 1987. *Theories of Second-Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold.

MCLAUGHLIN, B. 1990. "Restructuring." *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 113–128.

RAIMES, A. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

RAIMES, A. 1985. "What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 229–258.

RAIMES, A. 1987. "Language proficiency, writing ability, and composing strategies: A study of ESL college student writers." *Language Learning*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 439–468.

SCHACHTER, J. 1974. "An error in error analysis." *Language Learning*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 205–214.

SCHMIDT, R. 1990. "The role of consciousness in second language learning." *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 11, pp. 129–158.

SNELL-HORNBY, M. 1985. "Translation as a means of integrating language teaching and linguistics." In *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching and Testing*. C. Titford and A.E. Hieke (eds.). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, pp. 21–28.

SORIUS, H. 1975. *Translation and Second Language Learning: Should the Mother Tongue Really Be Discouraged?* Ottawa: Research Division, Directorate of Studies, Staff Development Branch, Public Service Commission.

SWAIN, M. 1985. "Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development." In *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. S. Gass and C. Madden (eds.). Cambridge: Newbury House, pp. 235–253.

TITFORD, C. and A.E. HIEKE (eds.). 1985. *Translation in Foreign Language Teaching and Testing*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

UZAWA, K. and A. CUMMING. 1989. "Writing strategies in Japanese as a foreign language: Lowering or keeping up the standards." *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 178–194.

WENDEN, A. and J. RUBIN (eds.). 1987. *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

ZAMEL, V. 1976. "Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 67–76.

ZAMEL, V. 1982. "Writing: The process of discovering meaning." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 195–209.

ZAMEL, V. 1983. "The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 165–187.

FL023329

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Translation, L1 Writing, and L2 Writing of Japanese ESL Learners	
Author(s): KOZUE UZAWA	
Corporate Source: Journal of the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics	Publication Date: 1994 (16:2)

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

☐ ← **Sample sticker to be affixed to document**

Sample sticker to be affixed to document → ☑

Check here
Permitting microfiche (4" x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sample
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Level 1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sample
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Level 2

or here
Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: R Aut. Papen	Position: PRESIDENT/EDITOR
Printed Name: ROBERT A. PAPEN	Organization: CAAL - JOURNAL OF THE CAAL
Address: CAAL SECRETARIAT DEPT. DE LINGUISTIQUE UQAM, CP 8888, SUCC. CENTRE-VILLE MONTREAL, QC H3C 3P8 CANADA	Telephone Number: (519) 987-8416
	Date: 21.11.95

OVER

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information reguarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:	
Address:	
Price Per Copy:	Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

If you are making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, you may return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Facility
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 300
Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305
Telephone: (301) 258-5500

(Rev. 9/91)

AAAL 1995

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Translation, L1 Writing, and L2 Writing of Japanese ESL Learners.	
Author(s): KOZUE UZAWA	
Corporate Source: Journal of the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics	Publication Date: Autumn 1994 V16, No. 2

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

publication needs Level 2 →

☑ ← Sample sticker to be affixed to document

Sample sticker to be affixed to document → ☐

Check here
Permitting microfiche (4" x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Level 1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Level 2

or here
Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Kozue Uzawa	Position: Visiting Asst. prof.
Printed Name: KOZUE UZAWA	Organization: Western Washington Univ.
Address: #204-1045 Burnaby St. Vancouver BC V6E 1N9	Telephone Number: home (604) 685-6957 Office (360) 650-3339
	Date: Sept 12/95

OVER

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics	
Address: CAAL Secretariat, Univ. of Québec at Montreal, Linguistics Dept. C.P. 8888, Succ. A, Montréal Québec H3C 3P8	
Price Per Copy: ?	Quantity Price: ?

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Languages & Linguistics
1118 22nd Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

(Rev. 9/91)